



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

agree with him that it is not to be imagined that they drew only from Christian sources (pp. 301 ff.). As a minor criticism it may be added that there is no point in adducing the purely verbal parallel between Arist. *De. caelo* ii. 13 and Bas. *Hex.* 21C (p. 51), even though the note on the following page shows that Professor Gronau is not in error as to their interpretation. Stählin (*B. ph. W.*, xxxiii, 259) called attention to this in his review of Professor Gronau's preliminary monograph on Basil's sources.

The Genesis commentaries still offer a rich field for investigation and it is to be hoped that they may be the subject of other researches as able and painstaking as this.

FRANK EGLESTON ROBBINS

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

PART X OF THE DIATESSARICA

Dr. Abbott's impressive series of *Diatessarica* has reached a "constructive" stage. Nine volumes (besides an index volume) have been devoted to elaborate studies of special topics in the Gospels, and now finally Part X, to consist of five sections of a volume each, aims to unite the results thus far attained into an orderly exposition of the gospel narrative. Two¹ of these five volumes have appeared, of which the first states the principles of interpretation adopted, while the second applies these principles to the first fifteen verses of Mark and parallels—the conception of "parallels," however, being a wide one. All four Gospels are treated in detail, but the interest is chiefly in the Fourth; in fact, so great is the interest in the Fourth Gospel that the Synoptists seem to be studied chiefly for the light that they can throw upon this Gospel.

The principles of interpretation are, for the most part, those developed in the earlier volumes of the series. John aimed primarily at an interpretation of the Christian tradition for the needs of the church of his day, which was beset on all sides by Jewish and Judaistic conservatism, imperial suspicion, philosophic contempt, and nascent gnostic heresies. His personality is quite uncertain, but he was past question a Jew, who used in his interpretation all the expository methods that had been brought to a high stage of development by his countrymen. In part, these methods are to be learned from a study of the later books of the Old Testament (Dr. Abbott sets up the interesting proportion

¹ *The Fourfold Gospel*. By Edwin A. Abbott. Section I. *Introduction*. Cambridge: University Press, 1913. xvi+177 pages. 2s. 6d. Section II. *The Beginning*. Cambridge: University Press, 1914. xxiii+456 pages. 12s. 6d.

John:Synoptists::Chronicles:Kings) but they are to be studied chiefly in the Talmud and the Targums, from which Dr. Abbott gives copious extracts in illustration. John possessed also, as was natural, a knowledge of Philonic allegory and used it rather freely, while to a lesser extent the methods of certain of the Greek writers were put under contribution. But as regards the tradition that was subjected to this interpretation, Dr. Abbott's position has undergone a considerable change. He now holds that John was in possession of information regarding the life and teaching of Jesus that was for the most part of high historical value, frequently, indeed, being more accurate than that of the Synoptists. On this John drew copiously. But he drew on it only to correct the official tradition of the church, which tradition consisted precisely of our present Synoptic Gospels, *verbatim et literatim*.

The emphasis with which Dr. Abbott states this last contention cannot be exaggerated: "We shall regard the Evangelist as having the three Synoptic Gospels open before him" (*Beginning*, p. xiv). John knew that Mark was the earliest of these Gospels and knew also that it was relatively the most reliable, so that he was disturbed by the fact that Matthew and Luke so frequently alter Mark's narrative. All of these alterations, Dr. Abbott contends, were noted by John with the minute scrupulosity of a modern student of the synoptic problem, and in the great majority of such cases John felt himself called on to come to the defense of Mark, either by corroborating or by explaining the passage that had repelled Matthew or Luke. So, e.g., the use of "spittle" in John 9:6 bears out its use in Mark 7:33, 8:23, although Matthew and Luke omit it. Such an explanation of Mark by John, Dr. Abbott calls a "Johannine intervention," and he maintains that in practically every case such an intervention can be found or a satisfactory reason for "non-intervention" assigned. Indeed, so convinced is he of the validity of the theory that he tells us (*Beginning*, p. xi) that he had planned originally to use the title "Johannine Interventions" in place of "The Fourfold Gospel."

These interventions, however, are usually far from palpable, and frequently they can be discovered only by a very liberal application of Philonic-rabbinical methods. So the "wild beasts" of Mark 1:13, which do not appear in Matthew or Luke, are allegorized into hostile human beings and then re-allegorized into "serpents," and so the corroboration of Mark is found in John 3:14 (*Beginning*, pp. 165-66). Nor need the "intervention" have at all the same context as the passage defended. This fact explains the remarkable production of a 306-page

commentary on fifteen verses of Mark, for in order to find the interventions, passages taken from the whole extent of John are examined.

At times, even, the connection traced degenerates into the purely fanciful ("The word *ev-angel* implies an *angel*, or '*messenger*.' . . . Luke's Gospel deals largely with '*angels*.' John's Gospel does not" [*Beginning*, p. 10]), or the merely homiletic ("Prayers are angels. But tears, too, are angels" [p. 193]). With such exegetical and critical rules, it would seem that almost anything might be deduced from anything, and consequently this thesis of Dr. Abbott's fails to carry conviction. Indeed, the fundamental assumption is not established, for the only proof brought that John did actually know the Synoptists is of the same precarious character. There are, to be sure, as is well known, some indications that point to John's knowing Mark and some rather obscure phenomena that connect John with Luke. But from these to a literary use of the Synoptists by John is a very long step.

Proof of independent historic knowledge on the part of John is confined in the present volume to defending John's account of a preliminary Judean ministry. The arguments adduced are of varying value, but on the whole a very good case is made out.

The great value of the book, however, lies in the immense amount of detail offered for the interpretation of John. Recent writers on the Fourth Gospel have emphasized, and rightly, its affinities with other Hellenistic religious documents. Dr. Abbott has not ignored these affinities, but he declines to consider them predominant and in their place stresses the Jewish origin. In this he seems to be right, past question. His collection of rabbinical material is voluminous, and in this point alone his works acquire a unique value, although much that he brings will no doubt be thought irrelevant. The volumes are certainly not adapted to serve as a first introduction to the Johannine problem, but no student of the Gospels is so far advanced that he will not gain unending profit from the quiet, thorough scholarship and delicacy of spiritual insight that mark all of Dr. Abbott's discussions.

A somewhat elaborate appendix is formed by three essays¹ in *The Beginning*. The first of these argues that the word "Nazarene" as applied to Jesus was derived indeed from his origin from Nazareth, but that its use as a title for him and for the earliest Christians was influenced by the paranomasia *nēšer* = "branch" = "Messiah," and that the form "Nazoraean" is really derived from *nēšer*. A very interesting

¹ Published separately under the title *Miscellanea Evangelica* (I). Cambridge: University Press, 1913. viii+96 pages. 2s.

argument is developed. The second essay contends that the disciple "known to the high priest" of John 18:15-16 was Judas Iscariot, but the evidence adduced is unconvincing. The third essay is a rejoinder to Dom Connolly's critique¹ of *Diatessarica*, Part IX. Dr. Abbott continues to maintain a Hebraic origin for the Odes of Solomon. Like everything else about the Odes, this question will probably be argued indefinitely.

BURTON SCOTT EASTON

WESTERN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

DEMONOLOGY AND MAGIC

Six hundred Latin pages on *Demoniacs in the New Testament*² might be expected to contain the last word on the subject. Father Smit goes at his task with praiseworthy comprehensiveness of treatment, giving a historical résumé of the views of the Babylonians, Persians, and Greeks, of the Jews as seen in the Old Testament, the "Deutero-canonical" and "apocryphal" (=pseudepigraphic) books and rabbinic literature, and of the Christian church in all ages. He is able to quote much of the now extensive literature on demonology. Unfortunately his cursory historical treatment of the subject and his frankly dogmatic and apologetic exegesis nullify the scientific value his work might have had.

In Professor Montgomery's *Aramaic Incantation Texts*³ one steps into a different atmosphere. The author presents a scholarly edition and translation of some forty-two magical texts, with an exhaustive commentary and a full introduction, which contains such discussion of all other published texts of similar character as renders his work a complete account of the present state of knowledge in this field. With minor exceptions all the texts are prophylactics against demons inscribed on bowls found by the University of Pennsylvania expedition in the ruins of houses in Nippur and now preserved in the university museum. Judging from the strata in which the bowls were found, as well as from their language and paleography, Montgomery decides that they should

¹ *Journal of Theological Studies*, July, 1913, pp. 530-38.

² *De Daemoniacis in Historia Evangelica*. Dissertatio exegetico-apologetica quam exaravit Johannes Smit. Romae: Sumptibus Pontificii Instituti Biblici (Bretschneider), 1913. xxiv+590 pages.

³ *Aramaic Incantation Texts from Nippur*. By James A. Montgomery. University of Pennsylvania, The Museum, Publications of the Babylonian Section, Vol. III. Philadelphia, 1913. 326 pages+xli plates.